



Docket No.: 250567US26

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/801,012

Applicants: Jun OZAWA, et al.

Filing Date: March 16, 2004

For: PROCESSED OBJECT PROCESSING APPARATUS,
PROCESSED OBJECT PROCESSING METHOD,
PRESSURE CONTROL METHOD, PROCESSED
OBJECT TRANSFER METHOD, AND TRANSFER
APPARATUS

Group Art Unit: 1765

Examiner: DAHIMENE, M.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

Response to Restriction Requirement

Information Disclosure Statement

PTO-1449

GERMAN Office Action (with English translation)

Cited References (7)

Our check in the amount of **\$0.00** is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Steven P. Wehrhouch
Registration No. 32,829

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)
(703) 413-2220 (fax)

Philip J. Hoffmann
Registration No. 46,340



DOCKET NO: 250567US26

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

RE APPLICATION OF

JUN OZAWA, ET AL.

: EXAMINER: DAHIMENE, M.

SERIAL NO: 10/801,012

:

FILED: MARCH 16, 2004

: GROUP ART UNIT: 1765

FOR: PROCESSED OBJECT
PROCESSING APPARATUS,
PROCESSED OBJECT PROCESSING
METHOD, PRESSURE CONTROL
METHOD, PROCESSED OBJECT
TRANSFER METHOD, AND TRANSFER
APPARATUS

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the restriction requirement dated October 4, 2005, the invention of group I, including claims 1-5, 13-16 and 24-25, drawn to an apparatus, is elected with traverse.

Specifically, the restriction requirement is traversed for the following reason.

MPEP § 803 states:

... If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

All of the pending claims appear to be part of an overlapping search area.

Accordingly, the restriction requirement is traversed on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner.

Application No. 10/801,012
Reply to Office Action of October 4, 2005

Therefore, it is requested that the requirement to elect a single invention be withdrawn, and that a full examination on the merits of Claims 1-25 be conducted.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)



Steven P. Weihrouch
Registration No. 32,829
Attorney of Record

I:\ATTY\SPW\2312 TOKYO ELECTRON\CHUO\250567 CHUO\250567_RESTRICTION.DOC

Philip J. Hoffmann
Registration No. 46,340